## Remarks

Claims 166-185 are pending in the application. Claims 166-185 stand rejected. Claims 167 and 177 are amended herein.

Claims 167 and 177 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis for the claim limitation "wherein the web call". Claims 167 and 177 are amended herein to comply.

Claims 166-185 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent 6,493,447 (Goss et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claims 166 and 176 require receiving the voice call originating from the user device including the cookie, processing the cookie from the user device to select one of the call center resources, and routing the voice call originating from the user device to the selected one of the call center resources. Advantageously, a caller can initiate a voice call and be routed and connected to a call center resource without having to wait for a call-back. The voice call from the user can be maintained until an agent is available. The agent does not generate a voice call call-back at a later time.

Goss does not include all elements of the independent claims. The limitation of "routing the voice call originating from the user device to the selected one of the call center resources" is not met by the Goss reference. Therefore, there is a clear error in the rejection.

In Goss, an available agent references a previously received and stored call-back request and generates a new (and later in time) telephone call to the requester (see col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 8, col. 7, lines 55-58, col. 8, lines 35-40, col. 12, lines 9-22, and col. 14, lines 30-32, 40-45). Goss states that "A call-back time can be solicited to state when the customer would like to be called back" (see col. 13, lines 9-15). Goss states that if a call-back time is not requested, then Goss assumes that the customer is requesting a call-back "as soon as possible."

The Office Action asserts that Goss includes "[r]outing the voice call originating from the user device to the selected one of the call center resources" and cites col. 6, lines 55-65 and col. 7, lines 1-10 in support of this assertion.

6

The assertion is incorrect. The cited text of Goss at col. 6, lines 55-65 teaches that an Intranet Server 66 passes a "call-back request" to a Contact Server 28, which in turn queries a skills table to identify those agents qualified to handle the call-back request (*i.e.*, to identify an agent recipient of the request). The cited text at col. 7, lines 1-10 teaches that the Contact Server 28 sends the call-back request to the identified recipient agent.

Goss therefore does not anticipate independent claims 166 and 176. Dependent claims 167-175 and 177-185 are allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 166 and 176. Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection and allowance of pending claims 166-185.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interest of brevity. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims.

Please feel free to call me to discuss the patentability of the pending claims.

Date: 3/9/06

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Gregg Jansen, Reg. No. 46,799
Setter Ollila LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 14
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Harley R. Ball
Sprint Law Department
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100

7